

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed November 26, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 8, 9, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0062392 to Nishikawa et al. (hereinafter, "Nishikawa") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,058,458 to Munezane (hereinafter, "Munezane"); and rejected claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishikawa in view of Munezane and U.S. Patent No. 6,326,844 to Morris, Jr. et al. (hereinafter, "Morris").

By this Reply, Applicants amend claims 8 and 14, and cancel claims 15 and 16 without prejudice or disclaimer of their subject matter. Claims 1-7 and 10-13 were previously canceled. Accordingly, claims 8, 9, and 14 are currently pending.

In light of the foregoing amendments and based on the reasoning presented below, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and request the allowance of pending claims 8, 9, and 14.

I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 8, 9, and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited art.

In this application, the cited art fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of Applicants' amended independent claims 8 and 14. Specifically, although differing in scope, claims 8 and 14 have been amended to include the recitations similar to those of now-canceled dependent claims 15 and 16. Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 8 and 14 are allowable

because neither Nishikawa, nor Munezane, nor Morris, taken alone or in any reasonable combination, teaches or suggests, at least Applicants' claimed

"an embedded controller configured to control a supply of power to the AV function unit and interrupt the supply of power;

a status signal line which is arranged between the network process unit and the embedded controller; and

an up/down signal line which is arranged between the network process unit and the embedded controller,

the embedded controller outputting a status signal indicating a status of the AV function unit to the status signal line, controlling the supply of power, and interrupting the supply of power based on an up/down signal on the up/down signal line . . . ,"

as recited in amended independent claim 8, and similarly recited in amended independent claim 14. By virtue of its dependence from amended independent claim 8, claim 9 also requires at least these recitations.

When rejecting now-canceled dependent claim 15, the Examiner acknowledges that "Nishikawa and Munezane [do] not specifically disclose[] an embedded controller configured to control power supply to the AV function unit for interrupting the power supply; and an up/down signal line which is arranged between the network process unit and the embedded controller" Office Action, p. 7. Moreover, the Examiner also acknowledges that Nishikawa and Munezane do not disclose "the controlling unit of the network process unit outputting an up/down signal providing an instruction to supply power to the AV function unit or to interrupt the power supply on the up/down signal line." Id.

The Examiner alleges, however, that "Morris discloses an embedded controller . . . and an up/down signal line," further stating that "control unit [20] sends a turn-on signal to [the] switch which activates the main power supply." Id. From these statements, it appears that the Examiner is drawing a correlation between Morris' control unit 20 and Applicants' claimed "embedded controller." However, even assuming such a correlation can be made, a conclusion with which Applicants disagree, Morris still fails to overcome the deficiencies of Nishikawa and Munezane.

For example, instead of the aforementioned recitations, Morris discloses a power input terminal 12, connected to a standby power supply 14 to provide power to control unit 20. See e.g., Morris, Figure 1. According to Morris, "control unit [20] sends a turn-on signal to switch 16 which activates the main power supply 18 which, in turn, supplies operating power to an audio/video signal processing unit 22 and to a video display unit 24 coupled to an output of the audio/video signal processing unit 22." Morris, 2:29-34. Morris also discloses that "[c]ontrol unit 20 is responsive to user inputs for providing channel selection signals, input selection signals and various other control signals (e.g., volume, color, tint, etc.) via a bus 26 to the audio/video processing unit 22 which, in turn, provides a video signal to the display unit 24 and an audio output signal to audio output terminal 28" Id. at 2:36-42.

In other words, the controller disclosed in Morris sends a turn-on signal to activate the power supply, and sends control signals to the audio/video processing unit. Morris thus fails to overcome the deficiencies set forth above, including the

failure of Nishikawa and Munezane to disclose or suggest, at least Applicants' claimed

"an embedded controller configured to control a supply of power to the AV function unit and interrupt the supply of power;

a status signal line which is arranged between the network process unit and the embedded controller; and

an up/down signal line which is arranged between the network process unit and the embedded controller,

the embedded controller outputting a status signal indicating a status of the AV function unit to the status signal line, controlling the supply of power, and interrupting the supply of power based on an up/down signal on the up/down signal line . . . ,"

as recited in amended independent claim 8, and similarly recited in amended independent claim 14.

Accordingly, none of Nishikawa, Munezane, and Morris, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests, either alone or in any reasonable combination, at least the above-quoted recitations of amended independent claim 8. Amended independent claim 14, although of different scope, includes recitations similar to those discussed above with respect to amended independent claim 8.

For at least the reasons discussed above, amended independent claims 8 and 14 are nonobvious over Nishikawa, Munezane, and Morris under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and should be allowed.

Claim 9 depends from amended independent claim 8. For at least the same reasons as set forth above in connection with its corresponding amended

independent claim, claim 9 is also nonobvious over Nishikawa, Munezane, and Morris under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and should be allowed.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.


Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 26, 2009

By:


Richard V. Burgulian
Reg. No. 31,744

[DAVID LONGO
Reg. No. 53,235]